



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/800,952	03/07/2001	Yigang Cai	Cai 19-13	6742
75	590 09/01/2004		EXAM	INER
Fay Sharpe Fagan Minnich & McKee LLP 1100 Superior Avenue			AL AUBAIDI, RASHA S	
Seventh Floor	Avenue		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
Cleveland, OH 44114-2518			2642	
			DATE MAIL ED: 00/01/200	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/800,952	CAI ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rasha S AL-Aubaidi	2642	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 26 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper reply places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period o fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply one later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the appropertion of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action: or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	Brief must be filed within the pe	eriod set forth in f the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	•	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	better form for appeal by mater	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	S.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	ion(s):	•	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ requence the application in condition for allowance be application. 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ecause: <u>see attachment</u> .		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment (explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b) uld be rejected is provided belov		nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,7-12 and 22-26</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appro	oved or b) disapproved by th	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen			
0. ☐ Other:	, , , , , , , ,	,	
		Examiner Rasha S. Al-Aubaid 703-605-5145	i

Applicant arguments have been fully considered and have been found not persuasive. Applicant argues that Bauer "fails to teach or suggest storing a subscriber's caller screening criteria in a database". As the examiner explained in the physician office action, Bauer teaches storing at least one of the subscriber's screening criteria in a database. This screening criteria may read on the caller identification for example (see col. 3, lines 5-25). Therefore, prescreening or providing screening capability to the user is one of the teachings and features that Bauer provides.

Applicant's also argues that "Bauer does not teach or disclose connecting the subscriber's telephone line to an Internet service provider". Bauer gives an example that a party on the phone may disable the call waiting service if the party is using the phone to be connected to the Internet service provider (see col. 1, lines 35-37).

WILLIAM J. DEANE, JR. PRIMARY EXAMINED